

MEMORANDUM FOR: JTH

Suspect: 22 June
F Y I

John:

[redacted] called for you last night about 5:00 P.M. In your absence he asked for me.

He is still working on the Employee Attitude Survey. One item that is attributed to an NPIC respondent to the questionnaire dealt with inter-office and inter-Agency bickering, feuding and politics as a cause for preventing valuable intelligence from being disseminated. He was puzzled as to what this meant, as was I. Although [redacted] has not identified the individual by name, he did ask OMS to verify whether or not the individual was a crank or whether his response could be

(over)

(DATE)

FORM NO. 101 REPLACES FORM 10-101
1 AUG 54 WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)

Declass Review by
NIMA/DOD

taken seriously. OMS has stated that from the balance of this man's questionnaire, it appears that he is a responsible individual.

25X1 [] is sending you a copy of this excerpt and would like your reaction. The courier is picking it up first thing this morning. I must say it didn't ring a bell with me and will reserve comment until I see it.


SA/ODIR

6/17/70

NPIC/D-193/70

23 JUN 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR:

SUBJECT : Attached Comment--#462--from Employee Attitude Survey

1. In my experience, comments in this vein are fairly common among intelligence analysts dedicated to particular area or functional specialties who have a selfless drive to see their analytical products used. From their viewpoint, a decision not to disseminate or not to publish information which they had a hand in developing usually is caused by an inter-office or inter-agency "feud" -- rather than by an honest difference of analysis or judgment.

2. I interpret the subject comment to be of that ilk -- from a person who is well motivated and dedicated but who has had such a narrow experience in the intelligence process that he is unacquainted with the wide variety of reasons why particular intelligence is used or not used at any given time. I suspect that he seldom sees or hears of the uses of intelligence that are made at "policy levels of the government."

3. Having made the above observations and guesses, I also note that there are instances when inter-agency disagreements caused by other than differing analyses of intelligence result at least in postponing the use of particular intelligence. Such situations are rather obvious and frustrating to the kind of person I have described, and encourage the human inclination to generalize. I also note that the "policy levels of the government" vary in their uses of intelligence from one administration to the next, with some administrations being more active and visible -- from the viewpoint of intelligence officers -- than others.

4. The comment might have come from another kind of intelligence officer. There are those who work in the R&D end of our business and who experience their own special brand of frustration. Such persons are too far separated from the substantive processing of intelligence and usually hear about only the signal successes and signal failures of intelligence usage. They are aware of the high costs of technical collection systems to the extent that they are sensitive to any real or imagined single failure to use the product effectively.

NPIC/D-193/70

SUBJECT: Attached Comment--#462--from Employee Attitude Survey

5. Having said all this, I think the key question about such comments is: do you or I believe it to be so? If my answer is "no," then I need to work more on surfacing the instances causing persons such as the author of this comment to believe it to be so.



25X1

Distribution:

Orig & 1 - Addressee
2 - NPIC/ODIR

NPIC/ODIR:JJH:1ak(23June70)